Pages 1 - 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES DONATO IN RE: CAPACITORS ANTITRUST LITIGATION,) No. C 14-3264 JD San Francisco, California Thursday November 10, 2016 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS APPEARANCES: For Indirect COTCHETT PITRE AND McCARTHY, LLP Purchaser Plaintiffs: 840 Malcolm Road Suite 200 Burlingame, California 94010 BY: STEVEN N. WILLIAMS, ESQ. For Direct JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC. Purchaser Plaintiffs: 505 Montgomery Street Suite 1210 San Francisco, California 94111 BY: JOSEPH R. SAVERI, ESQ. For Defendant GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER NEC Tokin: 555 Mission Street Suite 3000 San Francisco, California 94105 BY: GEORGE NICOUD, ESQ.

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON FOLLOWING PAGE)

Reported By: Debra L. Pas, CSR 11916, CRR, RMR, RPR

Official Reporter - US District Court Computerized Transcription By Eclipse

Debra L. Pas, CSR, CRR, RMR, RPR
Official Reporter - U.S. District Court - San Francisco, California
(415) 431-1477

1	APPEARANCES: (CONTINUED)						
2		<u>,</u>					
	For Defendant	BAKER & MCKENZIE					
3		Two Embarcadero Center, 24th floor New York, New York 10018					
4	BY:	DARRELL PRESCOTT, ESQ.					
5							
6	For Defendant Nitsuko Electronics:	,					
7	niopalo Erocroniop.	Suite 2000 San Francisco, California 94111					
8	BY:	BELINDA S. LEE, ESQ.					
9							
10		O'MELVENY & MYERS, LLP					
11	Rohm Semiconductor:	Two Embarcadero Center 28th Floor					
12	BY:	San Francisco, California 94111 MICHAEL TUBACH, ESQ.					
13		,					
14	For Defendant	MORRISON AND FOERSTER LLP					
	Fujitsu, Ltd.	425 Market Street					
15	BY:	San Francisco, California 94105 DEREK FORAN, ESQ.					
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							

1	PROCEEDINGS					
2	NOVEMBER 10, 2016 10:59 A.M.					
3	THE CLERK: Calling Civil 14-3264, In Re Capacitors					
4	Antitrust Litigation.					
5	Counsel?					
6	MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning, your Honor. Steve					
7	Williams for the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs.					
8	MR. SAVERI: Good morning, your Honor. Joseph Saveri					
9	on behalf of the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs.					
10	MR. NICOUD: Good morning, your Honor. Trey Nicoud					
11	for defendant NEC Tokin.					
12	MR. PRESCOTT: And Darrell Prescott for the Okaya					
13	defendants.					
14	MS. LEE: Good morning, your Honor. Belinda Lee on					
15	behalf of the defendant Nitsuko Electronics.					
16	MR. TUBACH: Good morning, your Honor. Michael					
17	Tubach on behalf of the Rohm defendants.					
18	MR. FORAN: Good morning, your Honor. Derrick Foran					
19	for Fujitsu, Limited.					
20	THE COURT: Okay. Come on up.					
21	So the idea now is you're going to do each one of these as					
22	free-standing packages, right? Get all the fees done and					
23	everything done at the same time?					
24	MR. SAVERI: Yes. We heard you loud and clear last					
25	time. So our plan is for each for each tranche of					

settlements, to have them kind of self-contained units. 2 So that means a notice program, which will include an 3 application for attorney's fees, will be a specific application 4 for costs and we will continue to do that until we're done. 5 THE COURT: And the only thing that -- that all 6 sounds fine to me, but I think Mr. Williams said: Well, maybe 7 we can save money by doing one round of notice, but --MR. WILLIAMS: Your Honor --8 9 **THE COURT:** Is that your idea? MR. WILLIAMS: No. I think it was --10 THE COURT: One round of claims? 11 MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. And the rationale for that --12 13 **THE COURT:** Ah, okay. 14 MR. WILLIAMS: -- that cost is going to be the same 15 whether we do it for this round or whether we do it later when 16 there are more recoveries. 17 **THE COURT:** So you want to just warehouse the money? MR. WILLIAMS: We think it would be more -- it would 18 19 save money essentially because we would be spending less to get 2.0 the money to the class members rather than doing it multiple 21 times. 22 THE COURT: We do notice. We let opt-outs happen. 23 We have a final approval hearing. We would have a separate fee 24 motion. And then people just would not get their checks until 25 the whole case is resolved, is that --

1	MR. WILLIAMS: Not necessarily the whole case. So					
2	if, for example, there were more settlements that become final					
3	next year, then it might be the appropriate time to process					
4	those.					
5	THE COURT: I see.					
6	MR. WILLIAMS: It doesn't have to wait til the end,					
7	but we just think if the estimate is \$200,000 to process that,					
8	it makes more sense to spend that \$200,000 once than					
9	THE COURT: I agree. I like that.					
10	What do you think?					
11	MR. SAVERI: So, your Honor, to me, it's really a					
12	trade-off or a judgment call between the value of getting					
13	dollars in the hands of claimants sooner, which there is a					
14	value to that.					
15	THE COURT: Well, let me just jump in. I assume this					
16	will be typically this money is invested and there are					
17	you know, you make some attempt to get a reasonable rate of					
18	return, that kind of thing. It's not going to be an interest					
19	free					
20	MR. SAVERI: No. We're not going to bury it in the					
21	backyard and then dig it up when we're ready.					
22	But the					
23	THE COURT: There may be other reasons to do that,					
24	but					
25	MR. SAVERI: Well, I didn't think we were going to					

talk about Tuesday today. THE COURT: No, no, no. I didn't say a word about 2 3 I want to be very clear, I said nothing about that. 4 MR. SAVERI: The great thing about -- I don't know 5 if we have enough -- at least from my perspective, have enough 6 time. 7 But I think we do have an interest in getting dollars in hands of claimants. We want to do it in an efficient way. 8 share Mr. Williams' concern that we don't want to blow all the 10 money, frankly, on administration when we could do it more efficiently. 11 12 **THE COURT:** So are you disagreeing? I think we may have a slightly 13 MR. SAVERI: No. different view based on the differences in the direct and 14 15 indirect purchaser class. We have a smaller group of people. 16 Our administrative -- or entities really. We have a smaller 17 administrative burden in processing those claims. 18 And so all I'm really saying is we -- we may end up in different places based on our calculation about what's the best 19 2.0 way to spend the money. 21 THE COURT: Well, what do you estimate your costs to be, claim administration costs? 22 23 MR. SAVERI: Well, we think that our current 24 estimate for a distribution to something is -- approximates 25 what Mr. Williams said, a couple hundred thousand dollars.

1 We have --2 THE COURT: If that's true then, I mean, so 3 Mr. Williams thinks you will save money on that. Why will we 4 not achieve the same savings? 5 MR. SAVERI: The only -- well, because we -- of the 6 way we have set up the claims program, we will basically 7 finalize the amount of the claims that we can use for pro rata distribution early in the process. We're going to be spending 8 resources up front to get that right. Once we have that kind 9 of done, it will make it easier to do it repeatedly. 10 But, again, Judge, I really think it's a judgment call 11 about whether -- the value of getting money back into the hands 12 13 of injured people. 14 THE COURT: Well, you're class counsel. What do you 15 want to do? Do you want to do it that way? 16 MR. SAVERI: I would like to have the ability to do 17 it soon. 18 THE COURT: That's fine. 19 MR. SAVERI: But I think the way it would work, your 2.0 Honor, is I think it's appropriate to have the flexibility to do that. We would not come back and do the distribution 2.1 22 until --23 THE COURT: I get that. Just to jump in. My only 24 concern is class members -- I don't want there to be tranches 25 where the rules change. I mean, I just want just adopt one

thing. Make it easy on the class members, okay? 2 So if you're going to do it that way, then do it the whole 3 way through. Okay? I don't want to do: Okay, this time we're 4 going to wait. Next time we're not. Next time we're not. The 5 fourth time we're going to wait. 6 Just pick one. I am fine either way. Okay? I mean, you 7 know, you're the shepherd of class counsel, making sure the money is not wasted. So if you decide that, you know, this is 8 not going to be a big waste, then that's fine. Let's just stick with it the whole way through. 10 MR. SAVERI: That's fine, your Honor. I would just 11 say that, you know, I think it's important for people who do 12 Rule 23 cases to be able to make sure that the people who 13 participate in them feel like they are getting real benefits in 14 15 a timely way and so one of those ways is to actually get a 16 check. So it's important to me to be able to do that sooner rather than later. 17 18 THE COURT: I agree with that. It's just I don't 19 want that to be at the expense of tripling the admin fees 2.0 though. That's all. 2.1 MR. SAVERI: I hear you, your Honor. We have no 22 interest in multiplying that unnecessarily. 23 THE COURT: All right. So I'll let you two -- just 24 pick one. If it's different, that's fine. Because you're 25 different classes, that's fine.

1	MR. SAVERI: Right.					
2	THE COURT: But let's do that.					
3	And then everything else has been fixed, right?					
4	MR. SAVERI: Yes.					
5	THE COURT: You're going to take your fees out.					
6	You're going to take your costs out. We're going to go through					
7	the whole thing on a set-by-set basis.					
8	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, your Honor. And what we have					
9	done is we put in the absolute most it could ever be. We hope					
10	it would be less, but at least we're giving the members notice					
11	of the highest amount that could come out.					
12	MR. SAVERI: There was a typo in my notice about the					
13	total amount of fee, though, that I wanted to bring to the					
14	Court's attention.					
15	THE COURT: Oh, a typo. Docket number is 1378.					
16	MR. SAVERI: Yes. Paragraph 19 of the notice.					
17	THE COURT: Oh, okay.					
18	MR. SAVERI: So we are asking for 25 we will ask					
19	for 25 percent of the settlement pursuant to the Court's					
20	benchmark. We did the math. Instead of it being 8,162,500, if					
21	you do the math correctly, it's 8,150,000. So we made an error					
22	and we apologize for the confusion, but we need to correct					
23	that.					
24	THE COURT: That's fine. We'll just fix that. Okay.					
25	I'm not going to do that. You're going to have to do that.					

```
That's fine. I appreciate that.
 2
        All right. Anything else on settlement?
 3
             MR. SAVERI: No.
 4
             MR. WILLIAMS: No, your Honor.
 5
              THE COURT: Defendants?
 6
             MR. NICOUD: Your Honor, no, your Honor. I think the
 7
    -- there was another concern addressed in the first hearing.
   We've submitted some papers on that, but if that's been taken
 8
    care of to the Court's satisfaction, that's fine.
              THE COURT: I think that's fine.
10
        All right. Anything else?
11
12
             MR. WILLIAMS: The only --
13
             MR. SAVERI: I'm sorry, your Honor. We did not set a
14
   date for final approval in our papers.
15
              THE COURT: Oh, yes. So how many days are we giving?
16
             MR. SAVERI: We contemplated 45 after the notice is
17
   given.
             THE COURT: That's a little brisk. I typically do
18
19
   minimum of 60.
2.0
             MR. SAVERI: Let's do -- 60 is fine, your Honor.
21
   And, frankly --
22
              THE COURT: It's the holiday season, too.
23
             MR. SAVERI: That makes a lot of sense. Frankly, I
24
   don't recall the date Mr. Williams had, but I know that I have
25
   a trial starting at the end of January, so it would make
```

```
sense -- it would help me if I could schedule it for a Friday.
 2
    I know that's when -- that's when this Court is dark.
                                                           If you
 3
    can't do that, someone else will have to handle it.
 4
              MR. WILLIAMS: If I could --
 5
              THE COURT: So what is 60 days from today, Lisa?
 6
              THE CLERK: It would be January 24th.
 7
              MR. SAVERI: We think it's probably going to take
 8
   until -- excuse me, your Honor. To get the notice out, we
 9
   would assume something like December 1 is when we'll mail.
              THE COURT: Oh, okay. Why don't we set it for --
10
11
              MR. WILLIAMS: If I may, your Honor?
12
              THE COURT: Yes.
13
              MR. WILLIAMS: It's not necessary that we be on the
    same schedule for the Indirects. Because we do publication,
14
15
    our program takes longer.
        We had submitted an entire schedule. Our mail and
16
17
   publication doesn't begin until January. And we then give 60
18
   days for objections, exclusions. So what we had calculated
19
   when you build in then responses to objections, final approval
2.0
   papers, was a final approval date of May 18th of 2017.
2.1
              THE COURT: That's fine. But you want to go faster,
22
   right?
              MR. SAVERI: I do, your Honor.
23
24
              THE COURT: How about -- what's the second Thursday
25
    in February?
```

```
week or probably more like back a week to May 25?
 2
              THE COURT: That's fine. May 25. When is -- May 25
 3
   is the date you want?
 4
             MR. WILLIAMS: May 25 would be the date we ask for,
 5
   your Honor.
 6
              THE COURT: Oh, there you go. May 25 it is.
 7
        All right. Anything else I can help you with?
                                Thank you, your Honor.
 8
             MR. SAVERI: No.
 9
             MR. WILLIAMS: No. Thank you, your Honor.
             THE COURT: Okay. Okay. Thank you.
10
11
        Oh, also the Chambers copies are dropping off, okay? Just
    one copy of everything, but we've not been getting them
12
13
    recently. So make sure you send me a Chambers copy.
             MR. WILLIAMS: We will make sure, your Honor.
14
15
             MR. SAVERI: Thank you, your Honor.
             THE COURT: All right. Thanks.
16
17
              THE CLERK: All rise. Court is in recess.
         (Proceedings adjourned.)
18
19
2.0
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE	OF	OFFICIAL	REPORTER
-------------	----	----------	----------

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Lletura X. Pard

Debra L. Pas, CSR 11916, CRR, RMR, RPR

Tuesday, November 22, 2016